Application no.: 09/592,079
Amdt date: September 15, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 14, 2003

# REMARKS / ARGUMENT

#### A. INTRODUCTION

In the prior office action, Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 9-13 under 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,758,083 to Singh ("Singh"); rejected Claims 6-7, 14-15 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of US patent no. 6,466,941 to Rowe et al. ("Rowe"); and rejected Claims 8 and 16 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh and Rowe in view of US patent no. 5,029,206 to Martino Jr. et al ("Marino")

### B. CLAIMS 1-5, 9-13 ARE PATENTLY DISTINGUISHABLE

Applicant submits that Claims 1-5, 9-13 of the present application are patently distinguishable from Singh. Independent Claims 1 and 9 have been amended such that the invention in the respective embodiments operate in the context of virtual private networks. The system therefore allows the edge devices to serve as endpoint in a VPN tunnel that aggregate, exchange, and abstract out reachability information of the networks associated with each endpoint.

# C. CLAIMS 6-7, 14-15 ARE PATENTLY DISTINGUISHABLE

Applicant submits that Claims 6-7, 14-15 are patently distinguishable from Singh in view of Rowe. Rowe discloses a database of hierarchical arrangement of data tables including a service center for responding to customer requests over a network. See Col. 20, lines 13-24. Rowe fails, however, to disclose any means for managing a network, configuring virtual private networks, or enhancing interoperability between networks. Rowe is therefore not pertinent to the present invention. Even if pertinent, there is no suggestion in the prior art to combine Rowe with any other art cited by Examiner. For these reasons and well as those stated in the section above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 6-7, 14-15 are novel and non-obvious.

Application no.: 09/592,079

Amdt date: September-15, 2003

Reply to Office Action of May 14, 2003

### D. CLAIMS 8 AND 16 ARE PATENTLY DISTINGUISHABLE

Applicant submits that Claims 8 and 16 are patently distinguishable from Singh and Rowe in view of Marino. Marino discloses a security management system, although it is silent to as to whether it may be utilized with a virtual private network. Assuming arguendo that the security management system is applicable to virtual private networks, it would appear to suggesting nothing more that is already known to those skilled in the art since many VPNs already employ encryption. Irrespective, there is no suggestion in the prior art to combine Marino with either Singh or Rowe. For these reasons and well as those stated in the section above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 8 and 16 are novel and non-obvious.

#### E. CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should there be any fees for this action, your office is authorized to draw from the firm deposit account number 02-3979. Should you have any questions, or identify any problem, I would appreciate a telephone call so that this matter may be resolved promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Blaine Brooks, PC

Bv:

Andrew S. Naglestad

Reg. No. 47,814

5010 No. Parkway Calabasas

Suite 104

Calabasas, CA 91302

Tel.: (818) 225-2920 ext. 202